

1
2
3
4 GABRIEL CHAVEZ, et al.,
5 Plaintiffs,

6 v.
7 SAN FRANCISCO BAY AREA RAPID
8 TRANSIT DISTRICT,
9 Defendant.

10 BRADFORD MITCHELL,
11 Plaintiff,

12 v.
13 SAN FRANCISCO BAY AREA RAPID
14 TRANSIT DISTRICT, et al.,

15 Defendants.

16 JERAMIAH COOPER, et al.,
17 Plaintiffs,

18 v.
19 SAN FRANCISCO BAY AREA RAPID
20 TRANSIT DISTRICT,
21 Defendant.

22 **Consolidated Cases:**

23 No. C 22-06119 WHA

24 No. C 22-07720 WHA

25 No. C 22-09193 WHA

26 **ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFFS'
27 SECOND OBJECTION TO
28 PLAINTIFFS' STIPULATED JURY
INSTRUCTION**

29 In June, plaintiffs submitted jointly stipulated-to jury instructions (Dkt. No. 95). Therein,
30 they stipulated to the following instructions regarding the undue hardship standard:

31 **Instruction No. 31**

32 An undue burden is shown when a burden is substantial in the
33 overall context of an employer's business.

34 **Instruction No. 32**

35 If a potential accommodation would threaten the health and safety
36 of co-workers or others, or increase a health and safety risk posed
37 to co-workers or others, then that potential accommodation
38 imposes an undue hardship.

39 (*id.* at 15).

The first trial began on July 8. The Notice of Proposed Charge to the Jury, filed on the third day of trial, adopted the language stipulated to by plaintiffs:

19.

An undue hardship is shown when a burden is substantial in the overall context of an employer's business. If a potential accommodation would threaten the health and safety of co-workers or others, or increase a health and safety risk posed to co-workers or others, then that potential accommodation imposes an undue hardship.

(Dkt. No. 138 at 10).

At the July 12 charging conference (more than a month after the submission of plaintiffs' stipulated instructions), plaintiffs objected to plaintiffs' stipulated-to language:

The Court: You're objecting to your own stipulation?

Mr. Snider: Yes, Your Honor . . . In common parlance, a hardship is, at minimum, something hard to bear . . . under any definition, a hardship is more severe than a mere burden . . . adding the modifier undue means that the requisite burden, privation, or adversity must rise to an excessive or unjustifiable level . . . So that's directly from the Supreme Court, how they define undue hardship.

(Dkt. No. 156 at 14). The Supreme Court decision cited, *Groff v. DeJoy*, came down well before the submission of plaintiffs' stipulated instructions. 600 U.S. 447 (2023). Plaintiffs relied on *Groff* in their class certification and summary judgment briefing.

The Court ultimately adopted the language on which plaintiffs' objection to plaintiffs' own instruction relied. The final charge delivered to the jury read as follows:

18.

A hardship is more severe than a mere burden, more than a *de minimis* burden, more than the imposition of some additional cost. Those costs have to rise to the level of a hardship. Undue means that the requisite burden, privation, or adversity is excessive or unjustifiable.

19.

An undue hardship is shown when a burden is substantial in the overall context of an employer's business. If a potential accommodation would threaten the health and safety of co-workers or others, or increase a health and safety risk posed to co-workers or others, then that potential accommodation imposes an undue hardship.

(Dkt. No. 144 at 8). Instruction 18 directly quoted the Supreme Court in *Groff*, as cited by plaintiffs, while Instruction 19 contained the language stipulated to by plaintiffs. In sum, plaintiffs received everything they asked for, twice over.

The first attempt to try this case resulted in a mistrial: the jury found for plaintiffs on their *prima facie* cases, but came to a 7-1 impasse, advantage BART, on the undue hardship affirmative defenses. Now, plaintiffs again object to the second sentence of Instruction 19, and in the alternative request the following changes (in bold) to that sentence:

An undue hardship is shown when a burden is substantial in the overall context of an employer's business. If a potential accommodation would [substantially] threaten the health and safety of co-workers or others, or [substantially] increase a health and safety risk posed to co-workers or others, then that potential accommodation imposes an undue hardship.

(Dkt. No. 168 at 2).

This latest attempt to alter plaintiffs' stipulated-to undue hardship instruction is an exercise in gamesmanship. It is **DENIED**.

Plaintiffs' arguments to the contrary cut no figure.

First, plaintiffs assert that "the terms *threaten* and *increase*" in Instruction 19's second sentence "contain no limitations on the size of the threat or increase," and therefore "work to revert the standard set forth in *Groff* to the *de minimis* rule rejected by the U.S. Supreme Court" (Dkt. No. 168 at 2-3).

Plaintiffs' blinkered analysis divorces the second sentence of Instruction 19 from the undue hardship instruction as a whole, which spans the entirety of Instructions 18 and 19. Instruction 18 lays out the *Groff* standard at length:

18.

A hardship is more severe than a mere burden, more than a de minimis burden, more than the imposition of some additional cost. Those costs have to rise to the level of a hardship. **Undue means that the requisite burden, privation, or adversity is excessive or unjustifiable.**

(Dkt. No. 144 at 8) (emphasis added).

1 The first sentence of Instruction 19, also omitted by plaintiffs, *again* quotes *Groff*: “[a]n
2 undue hardship is shown when a burden is **substantial** in the overall context of an employer’s
3 business” (*ibid.*) (emphasis added).

4 It is implausible that the jury will presume the appropriate standard to be *de minimis*
5 despite *clear* and *repeated* admonitions that “a hardship is more severe than a mere burden,
6 **more than a de minimis burden**” and must be “**substantial** in the overall context of an
7 employer’s business” (*ibid.*). It is clear, when viewed in context, that Instruction 19 need not
8 repeat the word “substantial” *thrice* to get the point across.

9 Plaintiffs add that the second sentence of Instruction 19 is “absent from *Groff*” (Dkt. No.
10 168 at 3). Correct. The hardship at issue in *Groff* was the monetary cost and “disrupt[ion] [to]
11 the workplace and workflow, and diminished employee morale” caused by an employee’s
12 refusal to work on the Sunday Sabbath. *Groff*, 600 U.S. at 456. *Groff* did not concern the
13 increased health and safety risk posed by an unvaccinated employee. That is presumably why
14 plaintiffs, when they stipulated to that sentence, cited to seven *vaccine mandate* decisions and
15 not *Groff*.

16 Second, plaintiffs argue that “the *threaten* and *increase* risk to health and safety language
17 . . . comes from *Bordeaux*,” which is distinguishable because the plaintiff-employee’s work
18 duties there required “intimate physical touching,” while those of plaintiffs here do not (Dkt.
19 No. 3). In *Bordeaux*, an actress requested a religious exemption and accommodation from the
20 vaccine mandate then enforced on the defendant’s movie set. “The nature of Plaintiff’s work
21 required close, unmasked contact with other performers,” and “[a]ccommodating Plaintiff’s
22 exemption request would have put the lives of her fellow cast and crew members in danger.”
23 *Bordeaux v. Lions Gate Ent., Inc.*, 703 F. Supp. 3d 1117, 1135 (C.D. Cal. 2023). The facts
24 here are not the same, plaintiffs argue, and the language should not be, either.

25 Plaintiffs’ attempt to cabin the language at issue to the exact facts of *Bordeaux* is, as
26 stated during the charging conference, unconvincing.

27 Moreover, the attempt to distinguish *Bordeaux* ignores the six additional decisions that
28 plaintiffs’ own stipulation cited in support of the language at issue (see Dkt. No. 95 at 13)

(citing *Bordeaux v. Lions Gate Entertainment, Inc.*, Case No. 2:22-cv-04244-SVV-PLA, 2023 WL 8108655, at * 13-* 14 (C.D. Cal. Nov. 21, 2023); *Kushner v. N. Y. C. Dep Y of Educ.*, Case No. 22-cv-5265-DLI-VMS, 2023 WL 6214236, at *5 (E.D.N.Y. Sept. 25, 2023); *Dennison v. Bon Secours Charity Health Sys. Med. Grp., PC*, Case No. 22-CV-2929 (CS), 2023 WL 3467143, at *6 n.7 (S.D.N.Y. May 15, 2023); *Aukamp-Corcoran v. Lancaster Gen. Hosp.*, Case No. 19-5734, 2022 WL 507479, at *6 (E.D. Pa. Feb. 18, 2022); *Robinson v. Children's Hosp. Boston*, Case No. 14-10263, 2016 WL 1337255, at *9 (D. Mass. Apr. 5, 2016); *O'Hailpin v. Hawaiian Airlines, Inc.*, 583 F. Supp. 3d 1294, 1309-10 (D. Haw. 2022); *Barrington v. United Airlines, Inc.*, 566 F. Supp. 3d 1102, 1109 (D. Colo. 2021)).

In *Kushner v. New York City Department of Education*, for example, a schoolteacher was denied an exemption from the defendant’s vaccine mandate and ultimately terminated. No. 22-CV-5265(DLI)(VMS), 2023 WL 6214236 (E.D.N.Y. Sept. 25, 2023). *Kushner* held that the defendant had established an undue hardship: “It is beyond cavil that safety within any work environment . . . is of absolute importance,” and plaintiff’s “unvaccinated presence would have imposed substantial increased costs in relation to the conduct of [the defendant’s] particular business by creating a health and safety risk that would have prevented the DOE from fostering a safe educational and work environment when COVID-19 vaccines had become available.” *Id.* at *5 (cleaned up). There is no reason to think that the plaintiff in *Kushner*, a schoolteacher, was involved in “intimate physical touching” of any kind.

At bottom, numerous decisions have considered the health and safety risks posed by unvaccinated employees in a variety of contexts. The undue hardship instruction accurately captures the rule that emerges from an objective review of those decisions. Plaintiffs so stipulated in June.

Third, plaintiffs argue that “the *threat* and *increase* in risks to health and safety for undue hardship language has never been used as a jury instruction” (Dkt. No. 168 at 5). This argument does not move the needle. Plaintiffs fail to identify how many Title VII vaccine mandate cases have otherwise gone to a jury. To the Court’s knowledge, the number is

1 vanishingly small, if it has happened at all. Nor do plaintiffs address whether those plaintiffs
2 (if any) stipulated to that language.

3 Moreover, this argument is at war with the prior one. In one breath, plaintiffs assert that
4 the language used in prior decisions simply will not do – the facts in *this* action are unique, and
5 the Court cannot look to prior vaccine mandate decisions, such as *Bordeaux* and *Kushner*. In
6 the next, plaintiffs complain that the exact language they stipulated to has not been previously
7 adopted as some kind of wide-reaching standard.

8 *Fourth*, plaintiffs argue that “*Bordeaux* is on appeal and thus not authoritative” (*ibid.*).
9 *Bordeaux* is a trial court decision from the Central District of California – it was never
10 “authoritative.” The reasoning in *Bordeaux*, and the slew of similar decisions cited by
11 plaintiffs’ own stipulation to Instruction 19, constitute *persuasive* authority. Plaintiffs’ own
12 stipulation and the final charge found that reasoning convincing. This order does, too.

13 Finally, plaintiffs assert that their “concerns are not merely theoretical” because, during
14 the first trial, Instruction 19 “proved to be confusing and problematic to the jury, *prompting*
15 *jury notes and extended discussions*” (Dkt. No. 168 at 5) (emphasis added). This
16 mischaracterizes the nature of the jury’s communications with the Court. The concern
17 underpinning plaintiffs’ objection – purported ambiguity as to the minimum quantum of
18 increased risk necessary to establish an undue hardship – did not preoccupy the jury’s
19 deliberations.

20 The jury *declined* to submit a note asking that very question. On the third day of
21 deliberation, the jury issued a note that read: “We, the jury, are at an impasse on every
22 plaintiff” (Dkt. No. 159 at 6). Back in the courtroom and with counsel present, jurors asked
23 several questions. Juror 7 asked, in reference to Instruction 19, “does it matter how big the
24 increase in risk is?” (*id.* at 8). The Court re-read the relevant instruction, and invited the jury
25 to “write out a question that the jury wants me to try to answer” if they require “further
26 guidance on [] that point” (*id.* at 9). The discussion then turned back to the issue of the
27 deliberative process, and the possibility that one juror, swayed by sympathy, was refusing to
28 engage in that process. The latter problem continued to plague deliberations, as it had in days

1 prior. As to Juror 7's question regarding risks, however, the jury did not make any further
2 request for clarification, despite the Court's invitation to do so.

3 During a separate discussion later in the day, Juror 8 stated that as to "Question Number
4 2 [BART's undue hardship defense] regarding 19 on the jurors' instructions, there is
5 agreement," and went on, again, to express concern that a juror was influenced by personal
6 sympathies (*id.* at 25). Juror 7's question and the Court's re-reading of Instruction 19
7 constituted the entirety of the jury's inquiry regarding increased health and safety risks.

8 The only other exchange relevant to Instruction 19 concerned a question distinct from
9 that underlying plaintiffs' objection (a purported absence of "limitations on the size of the
10 threat or increase [in risk]" in the instruction) (Dkt. No. 168 at 5). Near the end of
11 deliberations, Juror 2 asked, in sum: when evaluating the increased health and safety risk, if
12 any, posed by an accommodation, what is the baseline against which those risks must be
13 compared (Dkt. No. 159 at 29-31)? The Court clarified: "you're comparing what the risk
14 would be of someone who is vaccinated versus someone who gets an accommodation but is
15 not vaccinated" (*id.* at 31). Plaintiffs' counsel confirmed that the Court's clarification was
16 "essentially correct," and the juror confirmed that he understood (*ibid.*). The juror's question
17 (what is the baseline against which an accommodation's risks are compared?) was separate and
18 distinct from the concern underlying plaintiffs' objection (what is the minimum quantum of
19 increased risk necessary to establish an undue hardship?).

20 In sum, the concern that a juror was refusing to deliberate "prompt[ed] jury notes and
21 extended discussions." The issue raised in plaintiffs' objection did not. The jury declined to
22 issue a note probing the quantum of risk necessary to find an undue hardship, despite the
23 Court's invitation to do so. Discussion of the same was limited to a single question from Juror
24 7, followed by a re-reading of the instruction. The record does not support plaintiffs'
25 contention that the issue was "confusing and problematic to the jury."

26 * * *

1 Plaintiffs' objection is also untimely. Plaintiffs' counsel state that their six-page brief is
2 intended to "supplement" the oral objection to the undue hardship instruction they made during
3 the charging conference, and thus merely "provide[s] additional clarification of Plaintiffs'
4 position" (Dkt. No. 168 at 2). The specific additions and modifications now being sought were
5 not raised during the charging conference. Similarly, three of the four arguments now
6 advanced in support of those modifications were not raised.

7 The Court's July 11 notice of the charging conference stated:

8
9 [C]ounsel must, at the charging conference, bring to the judge's
10 attention any addition, subtraction or modification or other
11 objections or proposal for the jury instructions. Otherwise, all
12 such points shall be deemed waived and it will not be sufficient
13 merely to argue after the verdict that a proposed instruction (even
14 if stipulated) filed earlier in the proceedings somehow was not
15 adopted. Rather, any such proposal that counsel still cares about
16 must be raised anew at the charging conference. The charging
17 conference shall be conducted so as to give full and fair
18 opportunity for counsel to raise any and all objections and
19 proposals.
20

21 (Dkt. No. 138 at 1-2) (emphasis added). Plaintiffs raised their objection to the undue hardship
22 instruction at the charging conference and had ample opportunity to make every argument
23 available to them. This belated attempt at another bite, *seven weeks after the charging*
24 *conference and the first trial*, comes too late. To be clear: the Court will not entertain any
25 further objections to the final charge, novel, supplementary, or otherwise. The final charge is
26 just that –*final*.

27
28 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

29 Dated: August 31, 2024

30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000
1001
1002
1003
1004
1005
1006
1007
1008
1009
1000
1001
1002
1003
1004
1005
1006
1007
1008
1009
1010
1011
1012
1013
1014
1015
1016
1017
1018
1019
1010
1011
1012
1013
1014
1015
1016
1017
1018
1019
1020
1021
1022
1023
1024
1025
1026
1027
1028
1029
1020
1021
1022
1023
1024
1025
1026
1027
1028
1029
1030
1031
1032
1033
1034
1035
1036
1037
1038
1039
1030
1031
1032
1033
1034
1035
1036
1037
1038
1039
1040
1041
1042
1043
1044
1045
1046
1047
1048
1049
1040
1041
1042
1043
1044
1045
1046
1047
1048
1049
1050
1051
1052
1053
1054
1055
1056
1057
1058
1059
1050
1051
1052
1053
1054
1055
1056
1057
1058
1059
1060
1061
1062
1063
1064
1065
1066
1067
1068
1069
1060
1061
1062
1063
1064
1065
1066
1067
1068
1069
1070
1071
1072
1073
1074
1075
1076
1077
1078
1079
1070
1071
1072
1073
1074
1075
1076
1077
1078
1079
1080
1081
1082
1083
1084
1085
1086
1087
1088
1089
1080
1081
1082
1083
1084
1085
1086
1087
1088
1089
1090
1091
1092
1093
1094
1095
1096
1097
1098
1099
1090
1091
1092
1093
1094
1095
1096
1097
1098
1099
1100
1101
1102
1103
1104
1105
1106
1107
1108
1109
1100
1101
1102
1103
1104
1105
1106
1107
1108
1109
1110
1111
1112
1113
1114
1115
1116
1117
1118
1119
1110
1111
1112
1113
1114
1115
1116
1117
1118
1119
1120
1121
1122
1123
1124
1125
1126
1127
1128
1129
1120
1121
1122
1123
1124
1125
1126
1127
1128
1129
1130
1131
1132
1133
1134
1135
1136
1137
1138
1139
1130
1131
1132
1133
1134
1135
1136
1137
1138
1139
1140
1141
1142
1143
1144
1145
1146
1147
1148
1149
1140
1141
1142
1143
1144
1145
1146
1147
1148
1149
1150
1151
1152
1153
1154
1155
1156
1157
1158
1159
1150
1151
1152
1153
1154
1155
1156
1157
1158
1159
1160
1161
1162
1163
1164
1165
1166
1167
1168
1169
1160
1161
1162
1163
1164
1165
1166
1167
1168
1169
1170
1171
1172
1173
1174
1175
1176
1177
1178
1179
1170
1171
1172
1173
1174
1175
1176
1177
1178
1179
1180
1181
1182
1183
1184
1185
1186
1187
1188
1189
1180
1181
1182
1183
1184
1185
1186
1187
1188
1189
1190
1191
1192
1193
1194
1195
1196
1197
1198
1199
1190
1191
1192
1193
1194
1195
1196
1197
1198
1199
1200
1201
1202
1203
1204
1205
1206
1207
1208
1209
1200
1201
1202
1203
1204
1205
1206
1207
1208
1209
1210
1211
1212
1213
1214
1215
1216
1217
1218
1219
1210
1211
1212
1213
1214
1215
1216
1217
1218
1219
1220
1221
1222
1223
1224
1225
1226
1227
1228
1229
1220
1221
1222
1223
1224
1225
1226
1227
1228
1229
1230
1231
1232
1233
1234
1235
1236
1237
1238
1239
1230
1231
1232
1233
1234
1235
1236
1237
1238
1239
1240
1241
1242
1243
1244
1245
1246
1247
1248
1249
1240
1241
1242
1243
1244
1245
1246
1247
1248
1249
1250
1251
1252
1253
1254
1255
1256
1257
1258
1259
1250
1251
1252
1253
1254
1255
1256
1257
1258
1259
1260
1261
1262
1263
1264
1265
1266
1267
1268
1269
1260
1261
1262
1263
1264
1265
1266
1267
1268
1269
1270
1271
1272
1273
1274
1275
1276
1277
1278
1279
1270
1271
1272
1273
1274
1275
1276
1277
1278
1279
1280
1281
1282
1283
1284
1285
1286
1287
1288
1289
1280
1281
1282
1283
1284
1285
1286
1287
1288
1289
1290
1291
1292
1293
1294
1295
1296
1297
1298
1299
1290
1291
1292
1293
1294
1295
1296
1297
1298
1299
1300
130